



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/550,287	09/22/2005	Hideaki Yamaoka	10873.1753USWO	9535
52835	7590	01/23/2008		
HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER & LARSON, P.C. P.O. BOX 2902 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0902			EXAMINER GEHMAN, BRYON P	
			ART UNIT 3728	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 01/23/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/550,287

Applicant(s)

YAMAOKA, HIDEAKI

Examiner

Bryon P. Gehman

Art Unit

3728

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 November 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 10,11,13-17 and 19-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 10,11,13-17 and 19-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 3728

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 10-11 and 13-17 are finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claim 10, lines 3-4, "is transparent or semi-transparent" is alternatively indefinite and should be --is one of at least partly transparent and semi-transparent--. In line 4, "its bottom part" lacks antecedent basis and is indefinite as to what it comprises.

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 10, 13-17 and 19-22 are finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 2001141686 in view of either one of Lynch et al. (5,447,229) and Stewart et al. (4,589,547). JP 2001141686 discloses a sensor-container combination comprising a container including a container body (3), and a plurality of sensors stored in the container. Lynch et al. and Stewart et al. each disclose providing a container (70; 30; respectively) that has a transparent container body to allow viewing of the content of the container, with a non-transparent lid (98; 33ba). To modify the container of JP

Art Unit: 3728

2001141686 employing the transparent container body and non-transparent lid teaching of either one of Lynch et al. and Stewart et al. would have been obvious in order to allow visual assertion of the content of the sensor container, as suggested by either one Lynch et al. and Stewart et al., and closing of the container for shipping. The provision of portion of transparency as opposed to entire transparency is considered an obvious matter of choice and degree, the differences provided not being new or unobvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. "A combination of familiar elements according to known methods is likely to be obvious when it does no more than yield predictable results." *KSR Int'l v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S.Ct. 1731, 82 USPQ2d at 1396.

As to claims 13-17 and 22, to employ sensors having lightfastness, an apparently known quality in view of applicant's disclosure and discussion thereof, would have been an obvious substitution of interchangeable sensors in the combination.

As to claim 19, Stewart et al. discloses a circular shape for the container. To modify the shape of any container to the cross-sectional shape of its intended contents as claimed would entail a mere change in shape of the container and yield only predictable results. "[I]f a technique has been used to improve one device, and a person of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that it would improve similar devices in the same way, using the technique is obvious unless its actual application is beyond that person's skill." *KSR Int'l v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S.Ct. 1740, 82 USPQ2d 1396 (2007). A change in form or shape is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art, absent any showing of unexpected results. *In re Dailey et al.*, 149 USPQ 47.

As to claim 20, to provide the container body and lid of a conventional hinged arrangement would have been obvious in order to maintain the container body and lid in conjunction for ease of reclosing of the container body, as is conventional knowledge to one of ordinary skill in the art.

As to claim 21, to provide the container of particular color is a design consideration only, and does not distinguish any new or unexpected utility by its selection in and of itself.

5. Claim 11 is finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the art as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of either one of Yamamoto et al. (4,889,229) and Swain (3,139,976). The previous combination does not provide for a scale indicating the amount of contents in the container. Yamamoto et al. and Swain each disclose providing a container (11; 11; respectively) that is transparent and provided with a scale (15; 17 and 18) to allow viewing and determining the remaining content of the container. To modify the container of the previous combinations employing the scaled transparent container teaching of either one of Yamamoto et al. and Swain would have been obvious in order to ascertain the remaining content of the sensor container, as suggested in general for contents by either one of Yamamoto et al. and Swain.

6. Claims 13-17 and 22 are further finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the art as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of any one of

Art Unit: 3728

Say et al. (6,464,849), Feldman et al. (6,461,496) and Say et al. (6,175,752). Each discloses sensors that are composed of materials resistant to ultraviolet light, therefore having inherent lightfastness. To modify the claimed container of JP 2001141686 employing a particular sensor therein would have been obvious, the choice such as per any one of the Say et al. references and Feldman et al. being an obvious substitution to one of ordinary skill in the art.

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 10-11, 13-17 and 19-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection. The new grounds are discussed at length above.

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 3728

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Callery discloses a conventional transparent container body and opaque cover.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bryon P. Gehman whose telephone number is (571) 272-4555. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday through Thursday from 7:30 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mickey Yu, can be reached on (571) 272-4562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3728

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Bryon P. Gehman/

Bryon P. Gehman
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3728

BPG